

California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley
Organizational Options Brainstorming
May 18, 2006

Secretary McPeak reviewed the schedule for release of the draft Strategic Action Proposal indicating it should be out for review to the public by September 15, 2006. The purpose of today's meeting was to discuss the need for an organizational structure to implement the Action Plan.

The Secretary indicated the framework for the discussion should include the objectives of

- a. Continuity of process
- b. Leverage of strategic partnerships
- c. Mechanisms for implementation, measurement, etc.
- d. Sustained commitment at all governmental levels

There were a number of common themes included within the discussion that followed:

- Cabinet secretaries most relevant to implementation must be included
- There should be a public/private partnership
- Paid staff should support the implementation process
- The focus should be on implementation rather than creating new work
- Work group members should represent standing groups, organizations, etc.
- Single interest groups should work through sub-groups

Other comments included that "who is on" any implementing body is very important as existing structures have not succeeded to date so replicating them would not be productive. However, some believe these structures have not failed, but perhaps have addressed "local" issues rather than "regional" strategies and may just not have succeeded as of yet.

It was also suggested the organizational structure chosen should help implementation take place faster than is traditional. It was noted faster does not necessarily mean better. It was observed there has probably not previously been such a comprehensive effort so a new model needs to be created. There was a suggestion perhaps the Blueprint is a vehicle that might provide part of the structure.

The book *Civic Revolutionaries* by Doug Henton and John Melville was suggested as background reading.

Because there is confusion about what "regional" means, it was suggested this be considered an interregional effort. It could be legally constructed through a JPA or MOU.

There was a proposal for a "Joint Commission for the San Joaquin Valley." Some of the elements resounded with the group including enlisting the help of paid support staff and continuing with work groups composed of representatives from standing groups and organizations. Other suggestions under this model included the commission sunset and a cabinet secretary chair or co-chair the process. It was also suggested the commission be

appointed by the Governor and be similar in make-up to the current structure plus up to six additional member to share the responsibility of convening, as required. It was also recommended the structure be implemented prior to the expiration of the current order and be implemented through a new Executive Order or para-legislation.

Some general questions going forward are:

- Will there be a commitment to the effort by future governors?
- Can commitment of the secretaries be sustained?
- Can staffing continue to be done pro bono?
- Is there a “payoff” to keep people at the table?
- If the process is over-structured, will it lose its entrepreneurial focus?
- What can initially be accomplished and what can be sustained?

Additional comments were:

1. Focus on agriculture differently than just as a land use issue or part of air quality. It should be a primary economic development focus.
2. The Action Plan should be reviewed by existing bodies such as the Ag. Commissioners and other organizations.
3. The Action Plan will need to be “sold” to the Boards of Supervisors.
4. There needs to be obvious wins up front to point to as successes.
5. Decision-makers need to see the State as responsive to local needs.
6. The process and Action Plan need to be “rooted” in existing organizations.
7. Local electeds need to be educated about the importance of the Plan.
8. There needs to be state involvement for this to be a credible effort.
9. The plan and process need additional advocates. There should be a convening of County CEOs, City Managers and Attorneys, LCC, CSAC, CSBA, etc. to develop additional champions.

The following need to be addressed at the afternoon meeting of the Board on June 7th at CSU Stanislaus:

- Principles
- Organization
- Input strategy
- Briefing strategies

Members need to track presentations on the Partnership for the record. A short, consistent form should be developed and circulated.

PARTNERSHIP PRESENTATION FORM

PRESENTER: _____

DATE: _____

GROUP: _____

NUMBER OF ATTENDEES: _____

LOCATION: _____